

### REMARKS

Applicants' representative appreciates the courtesies extended during the in-person interview of March 23, 2009. The amendments and remarks made herein are in accordance with those discussed during the in-person interview.

The Non-Final Office Action, mailed December 19, 2008, considered and rejected claims 24-32, 34, and 36. Claims 24 and 34 were objected to because of informalities. Claims 24, 25, 27-32, 34, and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barnett (U.S. Patent No. 6,772,157) hereinafter *Barnett*, in view of Schmuck (U.S. Patent No. 6,021,508) hereinafter *Schmuck*. Claim 26 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Barnett* in view of *Schmuck*, further in view of Anglin (U.S. Publ. No. 2004/0199521) hereinafter *Anglin*.

By this amendment, claims 24 and 34 are amended and claims 45 and 46 are new.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, claims 24-28 and 34-45 are pending of which claims 24 and 34 are the independent claims at issue.

The invention is generally directed to zone based security administration for data entities. For example, claim 24 recites a method of splitting the one or more non-overlapping security zones into a plurality of non-overlapping security zones to facilitate more efficient delegation of rights to principals. Claims 1 recites identifying a grouping of data items and method items in the combined item hierarchy for which new common security rules are to be enforced. The identified grouping of data items and method items are currently included in an existing non-overlapping zone from among the one or more non-overlapping zones. Existing common security rules are enforced within the existing non-overlapping zone and the new common security rules differing from the existing common security rules.

A processor re-configures the one or more non-overlapping security zones so that rights can be delegated at a granularity that is finer than an entire database but yet coarse enough so as to not require delegation for each item. Re-configuring includes splitting the existing non-overlapping security zone into a new non-overlapping security zone and a remnant of the existing non-overlapping security zone. The arrangement of the new non-overlapping security zone relative to the remnant of the existing non-overlapping security zone is based on the

---

<sup>1</sup> Support for the amendments to the claims are found throughout the specification and previously presented claims, including but not limited to paragraphs [0027], [0044], [0045], [0049]-[0051], [0053], [0055], [0058], [0063] and Figures 1 and 3.

location of the identified grouping of data items and method items within the combined item hierarchy. The new non-overlapping security zone is for containing the identified grouping of data items and methods items. The remnant of the existing non-overlapping security zone contains at least one data item or method item from the existing non-overlapping security zone. Accordingly, splitting is restricted in such a way as to prevent overlapping between security zones and such that none of the data items and method items are included in more than one security zone. Re-configuring also includes adjusting data properties of each of the items in the identified grouping of data items and method items to represent that the identified grouping of data items and method items are contained in the new non-overlapping security zone.

For any principals that had existing rights in the existing non-overlapping security zone based on the existing common security rules being enforced in the existing non-overlapping security zone at the time the existing non-overlapping zone was split, those rights are retained. Thus, the rights are retained in the identified grouping of data items and methods items, subsequent to splitting the existing non-overlapping security zone and subsequent to adjusting data properties to represent that the identified grouping of data items and methods items are contained in the new non-overlapping security zone.

Claim 1 then recites granting other rights in the new non-overlapping security zone to one or more additional principals in accordance with the new common security rules. Assigning the other rights to the new non-overlapping zone collectively grants the other rights to each item in the identified grouping of data items and method items through the assignment of the other rights to the new non-overlapping security zone. The other rights differ from the existing rights.

Claim 34 is a computer program product claim corresponding to the method of claim 24.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited art of record does not anticipate or otherwise render the amended claims unpatentable for at least the reason that the cited art does not disclose, suggest, or enable each and every element of these claims.

Applicants submit that the art of record does teach or suggest either singly or in combination each and every limitation of independent claims 24 and 34 for the at least same reasons indicated in Amendment "E" filed on March 18, 2009.

Applicants also submit that the cited art fails to teach or suggest either singly or in combination:

...

an act of granting other rights in the new non-overlapping security zone to one or more additional principals in accordance with the new common security rules, assigning the other rights to the new non-overlapping zone collectively grant the other rights to each item in the identified grouping of data items and method items through the assignment of the other rights to the new non-overlapping security zone, the other rights differing from the existing rights.

as recited in claim 24, when viewed in combination with the other limitations of claim 24. For at least this additional reason, claim 24 also patentably defines over the art of record. For at least this same additional reason, claim 34 also patentably defines over the art of record. The dependent claims patentably define over the art of record at least for the same reason as their corresponding base claim.

However, applicants submit that some of the dependent claims also independently distinguish over the art of record. For example, the cited art fails to that the cited art fails to teach or suggest either singly or in combination:

an act of granting a set of rights in the non-overlapping security zone to the one or more additional principals so as to collectively grant the set of rights to the one or more additional principals for each item in the identified grouping of data items and method items through the granting of the set of rights in the new non-overlapping security zone, the set of rights including one or more rights selected from among: read, write, delete, and execute.

as recited in claims 44 and 45. For at least this further reason, claims 44 and 45 patentably define over the art of record.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that all the rejections to the independent claims are now moot and that the independent claims are now allowable over the cited art, such that any of the remaining rejections and assertions made, particularly with respect to all of the dependent claims, do not need to be addressed individually at this time. It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice, and particularly with regard to the dependent claims.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Instead, Applicant reserves the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any of the following fees that may be applicable to this communication, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 23-3178: (1) any filing fees required under 37 CFR § 1.16; and/or (2) any patent application and reexamination processing fees under 37 CFR § 1.17.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at (801) 533-9800.

Dated this 26<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2009.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER  
Registration No. 28,651  
MICHAEL B. DODD  
Registration No. 46,437  
Attorneys for Applicant  
Customer No. 047973

RDN:MBD:crb  
2321226\_1

---

relied on any Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicant specifically requests that the Examiner provide references supporting any official notice taken. Furthermore, although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.